

REMARKS

This amendment is in response to the office action mailed on March 31st 2005


Claims 5-9 have been amended and remain in this application.

Claims 5-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite as the phrase “used in conjunction with a secondary nail pulling detail” created confusion as to whether “secondary nail pulling detail” was intended to be a positive limitation of the claim or not.

Independent claim 5 has been changed to include the phrase “secondary prying surface” in explaining the “fulcrum” and replacing the word “secondary” with “second” in reference to the additional nail pulling detail. Support language for these changes can be found on lines 9 and 10 of page 12 of the detailed description. The applicant respectfully requests that the examiner consider this clarification that the “second nail pulling detail” is intended to be a positive limitation of the claim and withdrawal of the rejections for claim 5 and its dependent claims 6-8 is requested.

Claim 9 was rejected as being indefinite wherein there was no proper antecedent basis for the phrase “said plurality of staple pulling fingers”

Claim 9 has been changed wherein the phrase “said plurality of staple pulling fingers” has been struck and the words “nail and staple pulling detail” have been added wherein proper



antecedent basis would be established. Having made these correction, withdrawal of the rejection to claim 9 of this application is respectfully requested.

In view of the above corrections, it is submitted that claims 5-9 in the aforementioned application be allowable and the applicant respectfully requests notice to such effect.

Respectfully submitted

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be "S. Wayne Holcomb".

Steve Wayne Holcomb

A larger, more stylized handwritten signature in black ink, clearly legible as "Steve Wayne Holcomb".



In view of the above reasons, it is submitted that the subject matter as disclosed in claims 1-3 and 5-7 would not have been obvious over the combined teachings of Davis, Fiechter, Meriweather and Orthman and withdrawal of the rejection of these claims is requested.

Respectfully submitted

Steve Wayne Holcomb